

### REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter previously included in dependent claim 4. Dependent claim 4 was rejected based on Cajolet, under Section 102, citing column 9, lines 63, through column 10, line 6. However, the cited material in no way logs the tasks that are assigned. While a list of the systems that are utilized may be maintained, no such task list is maintained.

Claim 5 now depends from claim 1, as amended, and calls for developing an estimate of the time to task completion. Claim 5 was also rejected based on Cajolet. However, the cited material at column 3, lines 4-11, fails to teach anything about developing an estimate of the time to task completion.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was rejected over the combination of Cajolet and Anand. However, none of the material cited in columns 12, 14, or 67 has anything to do with querying said device if no results are received after the passage of a time estimate.


Claim 7 calls for automatically requesting said results after the passage of the time estimate. Anand is cited for this element and, particularly, the same lines set forth above with respect to claim 6. However, since these elements fail to teach claim 6, they also fail to teach claim 7.

On a similar analysis, the other independent claims and the dependent claims should be in condition for allowance. The objection to form in claim 8 has been cured.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 12, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]